



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

itum, and in each of which, therefore, the hereditary characters rest. *The idioplasmic structure, then, is to be sought for in the structure of the nuclear gemmule.* The above conclusions are much in harmony with many facts observed with reference to cells. Let us more especially recall the complicated phenomena of *Karyokinesis*, or indirect cell-division, in which we see the nuclear granules and microsomata pass through complex evolutions of divisions and conjugations, and, finally separate into two groups so as to give to each daughter cell a similar structure. This is especially seen in the division of tissue cells; and Strasburger and others have supposed that *direct division* results in dissimilar cells, *Karyokinetic*, the reverse. But if we believe the different characters of cells in ontogenetic differentiation are due to a separation of gemmules into corresponding differentiated groups, we should naturally suppose the more complicated process to take place in the latter case. See ROUX: *Bedeutung der Kerntheilungsfiguren.* Leipzig, 1883.

Significance of sex. NELSON. See abstract, this JOURNAL, Vol. I, p. 543.

Nelson has given a different explanation, referring the phenomena to sexual processes. According to this view all reproduction is sexual, but accompanied by different degrees of inbreeding or crossing,—the gemmules being looked upon as descendants of a common ancestor just as are the protozoa that conjugate.

We are now prepared to review the Pangenesis theory of Darwin. (*Origin of Species.*) The germ cells are looked upon as storehouses of gemmules that have come from all the cells of the body. Each sort of cell is supposed to have its special sort of gemmule, and these can indefinitely multiply their kind, and thus build up a cell, but at the same time there tends to be variation in their characters, not in a definite direction nor in response to definite stimuli, but often, of course, through the action of the environment when this is out of adaptation to the animal.

Ontogenetic development is explained as the successive activity of gemmules of the ancestors, which are all represented in the germ cells. Cell-division, resulting in differentiated cells, is accompanied by a conjugation of the gemmules of the next succeeding stage with the gemmules that have developed into the cell protoplasm or are active in the preceding stage. The weak point of the theory lies here. It does not show how the characters of the gemmules, nor how the conjugation of the gemmules, effect the evolution of the so differentiated cells. We should also expect, if the cells are giving off gemmules, that inoculation with the blood of a different animal would be the equivalent of a crossing or fertilization, but Galton's experiments in this direction gave negative results. These experiments, it seems to us, have too hastily been taken to disprove the theory; they appear to give negative proof only. Another objection to the theory has been, that the number of gemmules that must be gathered in an egg must in the higher animals be practically so great as to be unthinkable.

The Law of Heredity. W. K. BROOKS. Baltimore, 1883.

To reduce the number of gemmules needed was the aim of Brooks. If it were not for the fact of variation we could get along with a few gemmules, for then we need not gather up the gemmules from the body, because the germ cells of the offspring are the descendants of the egg of the parent, (true of all tissue cells) and of course have the structure of the ancestral germ cell. If now we suppose that gemmules are given off by cells only when a special stimulus is received, as (e. g., when the environment calls for better adaptation) then these gemmules will vary from their like in the egg and will hybridize the latter, and thus produce

(during development) variation of the organ in question. Furthermore, arguments are marshalled to prove the male animal is more variable than the female. We may suppose a division of labor has arisen, by which the male germ-cell has acquired the special function of storing up gemmules of this sort. The egg is the conservative hereditary factor in sexual conjugation, and the spermatozoon the progressive one. Facts are offered to show that in reciprocal crossing the male exerts a more variable influence than the female.

Die Bedeutung der sexuellen Fortpflanzung für die Selektionstheorie. WEISMANN. Jena, 1886.

This author objects to this theory on the ground that when animals are out of relation with their environment the special organ which is weak is not directly affected, and may even be in harmony with the other organs, (if one organ varies all must vary,) and hence will not feel any special strain. For example, what special strain can there be on the green of a moth's wing which does not match the color of a forest leaf, and thus exposes the moth to the attack of birds. His other objection, that the paternal character is as often masked by the prepotent maternal, due to the more rapid multiplication of the maternal idioplasm, does not seem to touch the point at issue. Weismann thinks that in asexual reproduction there can be no variation, and that variation ensues by the sexual union of idioplasms of diverse natures. Consider how multiform must be the variety of characters combined in each individual. The combinations for only ten generations amount to 1024. If now, slight variations in various directions ensue among the individuals of a species, when these variations are compounded the result must be, by algebraic summation, the continuous increase of special characters along definite lines in the course of several generations. But we ask, how can this be, except the minute variations are, in the majority of cases, in the right direction? Here is the very pith of the problem. There is also another factor left out of account, and that is the matter of sexual attraction, either between individuals or more especially between sexual pronuclei producing "prepotency." May there not be definite laws relating the structure of the two idioplasms about to be united, in a way most advantageous? Among human offspring the best and most beautiful offspring have been supposed the result of love matches, (Finck).

This opens up the whole question of the effect of the reproductive cells upon the soma, the reverse of the one we have been considering. The amount of nuclear material present is conceived as helping the process of self division, and when from any cause, as from lack of nutrition, the nucleoplasm is small, a stimulus to development is given by any sudden accession, as takes place in sexual conjugation of cells. This method, of occasional advantage to the protozoa, has been preserved with the metazoa, as it proved advantageous for producing variation, the protozoa not needing it for this purpose (?) as their body is directly changed by the environment. A further discussion of the question follows in the next paper, also by Weismann.

Die Continuität des Keimplasmas als Grundlage einer Theorie der Vererbung. WEISMANN. Jena, 1885.

Are we to conceive of ontogenetic development and reproduction as a repeated cycle starting with the egg, which produces an indefinite number of generations of cells called the soma; and then some of their ultimate generations becoming detached as eggs? Not at all. We must conceive, rather, that the germinal cells multiply like the protozoa, are immortal and direct descendants of each other, and that cyclically when reproduction takes place, some of the germinal cells divide on the plan